This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ❑ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ❑ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ❑ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ❑ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ❑ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ❑ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ❑ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ❑ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ❑ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ❑ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.
As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,103	05/10/2001	Frank Vosseler	20005779US	5806

7590 08/17/2004

HEWLETT -PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
LUU, LE HIEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/853,103	VOSSELER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Le H Luu	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *5/10/01 - 1/4/02*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/30/01, 1/4/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-18, 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Faigon et al. (Faigon) patent no. 6,006,016.

4. As to claim 1, Faigon teaches the invention as claimed, including method for monitoring objects within an information technological (IT) network having monitored nodes in which monitoring-relevant events occur, comprising:

generating event-related messages comprising a message key and a message relation key (col. 6 line 54 - col. 7 line 19; col. 11 lines 31-55);

comparing the message relation key with the message key of another message (col. 6 line 54 - col. 7 line 19);

processing the other message depending on the result of the comparison (col. 6 line 54 - col. 7 line 19; col. 8 lines 6-21).

5. As to claim 2, Faigon teaches the message key has attributes which characterize certain characteristics of the related event which are relevant for monitoring purposes (col. 19 line 65 - col. 20 line 37).

As to claims 4-5, Faigon teaches the step of comparing the message relation key and the other message key comprises checking whether the keys match with each other, and discarding the other message if its message key is found to match with the message relation key (col. 13 line 58-65).

6. As to claims 6-7, Faigon teaches at least one monitoring agent is associated with a monitored node, and wherein the step of generating event-related messages comprising the message key and the message relation key is carried out by the agent, and a monitoring server receives the messages and carries out the processing step (col. 6 line 30 - col. 7 line 19).

7. As to claims 8-9, Faigon teaches the message key and the message relation key are generated according to key patterns which can be defined on the basis of a set of pattern definition rules, and wherein both the message key pattern and the message relation key pattern are defined on the basis of the same set of pattern definition rules, and the method is carried out by a computer program, and the message key pattern and the message relation key pattern can be defined by a user via a user interface at a

common place of the computer program (col. 12 lines 6-11; col. 14 line 31 - col. 15 line 4).

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Faigon et al. (Faigon) patent no. 6,006,016, in view of Spencer patent no. 6,253,243.

10. As to claim 3, Faigon teaches the invention substantially as claimed as discussed above; however, Faigon does not explicitly teach using a wildcard.

Spencer teaches using wildcard to match ranges and sets generic-trap and specific-trap (col. 9 lines 37 - col. 10 line 7; col. 12 lines 32 - 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Faigon and Spencer to use wildcard in at least one attribute because it would reduce number of trap entry.

11. Claims 10-25 have similar limitations as claims 1-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Le H. Luu, whose telephone number is (703) 305-9650. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE").

Or:

(703) 872-9306 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

LE HIEN LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

August 16, 2004